

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5318	COUNTY	Los Angeles
APPLICANT	Downey, City of	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$375,000
PROJECT TITLE	Conjunctive Use and Treatment Plant Project	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$500,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In order to take advantage of over 300,000 acre-feet of available storage in the Central Groundwater Basin (Basin), this project will include the site evaluation and preliminary design of three new aquifer storage and recovery wells, the pipeline routing alternatives for connection(s) to Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) turnouts, and the water quality analysis and preliminary design of a centralized water treatment plant. The ASR wells would be utilized by water rights holders in the Basin for storage activities during periods when there is excess MWD water available. During periods of high water demands, the City of Downey would utilize the ASR wells as production facilities that would extract contaminated groundwater from the Basin for treatment at the treatment plant and distribution into the City's transmission and distribution mains.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 6

Comment: This proposal consists of the planning and conceptual design of ASR wells and a treatment system. However, no reference to development of a new IRWMP and/or completion or modification of IRWMPs in progress was included with this proposal. The work plan identifies deliverables, quarterly reports, and a final report, but the work plan, budget, and schedule are not consistent and lack detail. The budget is not supported, but indicates a funding match of twenty five percent.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant sufficiently describes the region for the proposal and the region's boundaries. While the region is appropriate for water management, the applicant did not discuss the region's water related infrastructure or the major land use divisions. The application includes a map that depicts the region and a map that indicates the proposal's implementation projects. The applicant broadly discusses its own water quality and water supply. The applicant does not discuss the region's ecological, cultural, or social makeup or values. The applicant introduces other agencies in the region, but does not provide detail on their participation in the project or state the benefits of managing water in the region versus local individual efforts.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The interpreted objective of the proposal is to assure a long-term water supply for the applicant, and provide a conjunctive use facility for other water providers in the Central Basin. The application does not directly state how this objective was determined. To a limited degree, the application addresses water supply, water quality, and groundwater management. The application is of insufficient detail to discern, with any degree of confidence, that it would address statewide priorities sufficiently.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal does not include multiple water management strategies or a technical process for determining water management strategies. The applicant also does not demonstrate an understanding of how water management strategies would work together to produce synergistic effects in water management.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: No reference to development of a new IRWMP and/or completion or modification of IRWMPs in progress was provided. Planning and conceptual design of ARS wells and a treatment system does not constitute broad and detailed IRWMP implementation. Although the proposal has a general schedule for implementation of the work plan, there is no mechanism or process in the proposal that allows for monitoring the performance of a IRWMP.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The application gives an extremely brief narration of only a single impact (well siting). The application includes an expanded discussion of how they would comply with CEQA. Benefits of the proposed ARS well include giving interested agencies access to available storage space in the Central Basin and allowing them to store imported water, thereby lessening the impact to their customers during periods of drought. However, with no proposed IRWMP, no IRWM benefits were demonstrated.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: Studies have been conducted and would be further conducted "to verify the conclusions determined upon the analyses of existing data." It is uncertain if available data adequately supports the proposed ARS well.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The application does not include a process for gathering and managing data and for disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public. The proposal also does not demonstrate how data management would support statewide data needs.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The application does not identify processes for stakeholder involvement, including how they may influence decisions. No water related entities within the region are included in the ARS planning process. The applicant also does not address any environmental justice concerns. A list of appropriate stakeholders is not included and no process is proposed to identify and include additional stakeholders.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The application does not discuss DACs.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The application does not identify local planning documents. It also does not indicate how local agency planning documents would relate to the IRWM water management strategies.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: The proposal does not provide for coordination and cooperation with relevant local, State, and federal agencies.

TOTAL SCORE: 26